

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/810,437	Applicant(s) BORNZIN ET AL.	
	Examiner JESSICA REIDEL	Art Unit 3766	

All Participants:

(1) JESSICA REIDEL.

(2) Derrick W. Reed.

Date of Interview: 7 January 2009

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
28, 32-36, 40-44, and 53

Prior art documents discussed:

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 3:30 PM

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Jessica L. Reidel/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3766
January 12, 2009

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner argued that the claims as currently filed fail to particularly point out and distinctly define the metes and bounds of the subject matter of which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner further argued that the claims (esp. Claims 28 and 32) are confusing and that the essential structural cooperative relationships of the elements are extraordinarily unclear and ambiguous. In an effort to advance prosecution, the Examiner proposed various changes be made to Claims 28, 32-36, 40-44, and 53 in order to ensure that the claims are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous while avoiding antecedent basis issues throughout. Applicant agreed to the Examiner's suggestions.